

PATENT APPLICATION

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER ART UNIT 2853**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Hidemasa SAWADA

Group Art Unit: 2853

Application No.: 10/717,589

Examiner: M. SHAH

Filed: November 21, 2003

Docket No.: 117827

For: IMAGE RECORDING METHOD

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the Office Action mailed August 15, 2006, the period for reply extended by the attached Petition for Extension of Time, reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-12 are pending.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Shah in the January 11, 2007 telephone interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Yatake, U.S. Patent No. 5,746,818. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously argued, Yatake fails to disclose an image recording method with a pretreatment step of causing a pretreatment liquid containing dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether and a cationic substance to adhere on a medium, as recited in claim 1.

Pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action stated that col. 12, lines 35-45 of Yatake discloses using a reaction solution with dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether. Applicant disagrees.

Col. 12, lines 35-45 first states that the reaction solution used in the ink jet recording may suitably contain a component which may be added to the above ink composition. Applicant observes the following: (1) contrary to the Office Action, Yatake does not state that the reaction solution can have the same water soluble organic solvent as the ink composition or that the water-soluble organic solvents in the ink composition and in the reaction solution are the same, and (2) previous to the identified passage, Yatake identifies various components for the reaction solution, col. 11, line 41 - col. 12, line 36, but does not identify dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether for the reaction solution. Based on a fair reading of Yatake, when Yatake discloses that a reaction solution may suitably contain a component which may be added to the above ink composition, Yatake is referring to the components listed in col. 11, line 41 - col. 12, line 36, which does not include dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether.

During the January 11, 2007 telephone interview, the Examiner asserted that because col. 12, line 40 uses the phrase "a component", then "a component" can include the components of the ink composition. Applicants respectfully disagree with this interpretation because (1) the entire preceding column refers to components of the reaction solution prior to stating that the reaction solution may suitably contain "a component," (2) a fair reading of Yatake would not infer that "a component" refers to components of the ink composition that appear seven columns away (in col. 5) when the immediate column refers to components of the reaction solution, and (3) Yatake explicitly states that "the reaction solution ... may suitably contain a component which may be added to the above ink composition." As explicitly stated by Yatake, something is being added to the above ink composition. Yatake does not state that a component from the ink composition is being added to the reaction solution as suggested by the Examiner.

Col. 12, lines 35-45 then goes on to state that the amount of such a component added may be the same as that in the case of the addition to the above ink composition. Applicant again observes the following: (1) contrary to the Office Action, Yatake again does not state that the reaction solution can have the same water soluble organic solvent as the ink composition or that the water-soluble organic solvents in the ink composition and in the reaction solution are the same, and (2) Yatake is discussing the amount of the component, and not the actual component that is used.

Thus, as previously argued, although the ink composition may use dipropylene glycol mono-n-propyl ether and dipropylene glycol mono-iso-propyl ether (col. 5, lines 22-23), Yatake fails to disclose using these ethers in the reaction solution. Yatake thus fails to disclose using the pretreatment liquid as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 also recites an aqueous pigment ink, and Yatake fails to disclose resin microparticles that have a negative surface charge and react with a cationic substance.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yatake in view of Koitabashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,582,047 (Koitabashi '047). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Koitabashi '047 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Yatake in disclosing or suggesting the pretreatment liquid, as recited in claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kubota et al. (Kubota), U.S. Patent No. 6,086,197, in view of Yatake. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As admitted in the Office Action, Kubota fails to disclose a pretreatment liquid containing dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether (col. 3, lines 13-20). As discussed above, Yatake also fails to disclose a pretreatment liquid containing dipropylene glycol monopropyl

ether. Kubota and Yatake thus fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kubota in view of Yatake and Koitabashi '047. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Koitabashi '047 fails to overcome the deficiencies of Kubota and Yatake in disclosing or suggesting the pretreatment liquid, as recited in claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koitabashi et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0044185 (Koitabashi '185), in view of Yatake. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As admitted in the Office Action, Koitabashi '185 fails to disclose a pretreatment liquid containing dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether. As discussed above, Yatake also fails to disclose a pretreatment liquid containing dipropylene glycol monopropyl ether. Koitabashi '185 and Yatake thus fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 2. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koitabashi '185 in view of Yatake and Kubota, and claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koitabashi '185 in view of Yatake and Koitabashi '047. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Kubota and Koitabashi '047 fail to overcome deficiencies of Koitabashi '185 and Yatake in disclosing or suggesting all of the features recited in claim 2. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of are earnestly solicited.